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4. A typology of local migrant policies

1. Introduction

In this chapter I propose a typology space that classifies local policies toward migrants as an expression of host-stranger relations. The aim is to create an analytical framework for summarising the various policy reactions of a given city to labour migrant settlement, also over time, and to allow a structured comparison with other cities.

The typology consists of two dimensions. The first dimension, based on criteria taken from the host-stranger relations literature, proposes several general types of local policy reactions toward labour migrants.\(^2\) The criteria can be applied universally (i.e. in different cities and time periods), to classify actual policies according to one of the general types. As described in section 4.2 below, these should be seen as ideal types rather than exact descriptions of alternative policy reactions. When several types are identified in a given city over time, we may call them phases of policy reaction to labour migrant settlement. The second dimension defines four policy domains (Juridical-political, Socio-economic, Cultural-religious and Spatial) subdivided into issue areas, in which the alternative policy types may be expressed. This is described in section 4.3 below. Together the two dimensions form a matrix, with the columns representing policy alternatives, the rows expressing issue areas, and the cells representing potential policy alternatives in specific issue areas (Table 4.1).

As noted in Chapter One, the purpose of the typology is to generalise beyond any particular city and historical context, without becoming overly abstract. To this end, the typology translates the concept of host-stranger relations into possible or potential policies in all the domains and issue areas, allowing comparison with actual policies found in a given city (Table 4.2). The policies in Table 4.2 are based on the findings of the literature survey (see Appendix 1), supplemented by those of the case studies.

---

\(^1\) An earlier version of this chapter appeared in Alexander 2003.

\(^2\) The criteria for defining policy types in terms of local authority assumptions and expectations toward labour migrants are discussed in Chapter 2, section 4 and summarised in Table 2.1.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>LOCAL AUTHORITY ATTITUDES TOWARD LABOUR MIGRANTS</strong></th>
<th><strong>‘TRANSIENT’</strong></th>
<th><strong>‘GUESTWORKER’</strong></th>
<th><strong>‘ASSIMILATIONIST’</strong></th>
<th><strong>‘PLURALIST’</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>re: temporal presence</td>
<td>Migrants as transient</td>
<td>Migrants as temporary ('guestworkers')</td>
<td>Migrants as permanent, but their Otherness is temporary</td>
<td>Migrants as permanent, and their Otherness will remain.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>re: Otherness (cultural/religious)</td>
<td>Otherness ignored</td>
<td>Otherness tolerated.</td>
<td>Otherness ignored / discouraged (assimilation or marginalisation)</td>
<td>Otherness accepted / supported.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>re: spatial separation (segregation)</td>
<td>Segregation ignored.</td>
<td>Segregation tolerated or formalized.</td>
<td>Assimilation will lead to spatial integration ('melting pot').</td>
<td>Some segregation acceptable in multicultural city ('salad bowl').</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### POLICY TYPES / PHASES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>**POLICY DOMAINS / **</th>
<th><strong>ISSUE AREAS</strong></th>
<th><strong>JURIDICAL-POLITICAL</strong></th>
<th><strong>CONSULTATIVE STRUCTURES</strong></th>
<th><strong>MIGRANT ORGANISATIONS</strong></th>
<th><strong>SOCIO-ECONOMIC</strong></th>
<th><strong>LABOUR MARKET</strong></th>
<th><strong>SCHOOLS</strong></th>
<th><strong>POLICING</strong></th>
<th><strong>CULTURAL-RELIGIOUS</strong></th>
<th><strong>RELIGIOUS INSTITUTIONS AND PRACTICES</strong></th>
<th><strong>PUBLIC AWARENESS</strong></th>
<th><strong>SPATIAL</strong></th>
<th><strong>HOUSING</strong></th>
<th><strong>URBAN DEVELOPMENT</strong></th>
<th><strong>SYMBOLIC USES OF SPACE</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>POLICY DOMAINS /</strong></td>
<td><strong>ISSUE AREAS</strong></td>
<td><strong>JURIDICAL-POLITICAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>CONSULTATIVE STRUCTURES</strong></td>
<td><strong>MIGRANT ORGANISATIONS</strong></td>
<td><strong>SOCIO-ECONOMIC</strong></td>
<td><strong>LABOUR MARKET</strong></td>
<td><strong>SCHOOLS</strong></td>
<td><strong>POLICING</strong></td>
<td><strong>CULTURAL-RELIGIOUS</strong></td>
<td><strong>RELIGIOUS INSTITUTIONS AND PRACTICES</strong></td>
<td><strong>PUBLIC AWARENESS</strong></td>
<td><strong>SPATIAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>HOUSING</strong></td>
<td><strong>URBAN DEVELOPMENT</strong></td>
<td><strong>SYMBOLIC USES OF SPACE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>POLICY TYPES / PHASES</strong></td>
<td><strong>NON-POLICY</strong></td>
<td><strong>GUESTWORKER POLICY</strong></td>
<td><strong>ASSIMILATIONIST POLICY</strong></td>
<td><strong>PLURALIST POLICY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy aims</td>
<td>De facto: ignore migrants.</td>
<td>Meet guestworkers' basic needs; ignore undocumented migrants.</td>
<td>Facilitate individual integration into host society (= assimilation).</td>
<td>Facilitate integration while maintaining ethnic-cultural identity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

54
2. Local authority attitudes and policy types/phases

The first dimension identifies four general types (or phases) of local authority attitudes/assumptions toward labour migrants, and their expression in four ideal types of local policy responses: Non-policy, Guestworker policy, Assimilationist policy and Pluralist policy (Table 4.1). These are described below, with examples taken from the literature survey findings. The 'Transient attitude' is typical of local authorities in the first years of labour immigration, when labour migrants make up a small and often undocumented population and may indeed be transient, i.e. just passing through. In this phase the local authority is either unaware of, or chooses to ignore, their presence. In the latter case the municipality regards labour migrants as a transient phenomenon: the expectation is that they will soon return home or move on to other cities. Avoidance of responsibility characterizes the Transient attitude. Within the municipality, however, especially among 'street-level bureaucrats' confronted daily with the migrant presence, opinions may differ from the official view. Indeed, different attitudes between the lower and higher levels of the municipality characterize this phase of local authority reaction.

The Transient attitude toward labour migrants is expressed in what can be termed Non-policy, i.e. the municipality turns a blind eye to the problem, in effect passing responsibility to others: employers, civic organizations, government agencies. This may be due to (wilful) ignorance or to policy prioritization that leaves no resources for dealing with this issue. However, lower-level bureaucrats in individual departments may adopt informal policies to meet pressing needs, as in Athens (1990s) and Tel Aviv (early 1990s). City Hall will also react to specific problems when they can no longer be ignored, such as migrant squatting that must be cleared if it becomes too great a nuisance (e.g. Rome, 1980s). Non-policy implies ad-hoc solutions to such crises -- it is figuratively and sometimes literally a matter of 'putting out fires'.

The 'Guestworker attitude' differs from the above in that the municipality acknowledges its labour migrant population, but considers this a temporary presence requiring limited solutions to short-term problems. This change usually (but not always) occurs when a national guestworker policy is initiated. The expectation, often shared by hosts and migrants, is that the newcomers' stay will only last a few years (the 'myth of return'). Furthermore, the municipality expects the 'guestworkers' to have only minimal needs, assuming this population consists of young single men and women willing to live frugally in very basic conditions. If the presence of families is recognized they too are considered temporary. Meanwhile, the municipality expects its share of responsibility to be minimal, with employers or national government being ultimately responsible for addressing most migrant needs. The assumption of controlled temporariness that characterises this phase means that spatial segregation is not necessarily considered problematic, and may even be formalised (e.g. in separate 'guestworker housing'). The formation of informal ethnic enclaves, street markets and so on

---

3 Unless otherwise indicated, references for the examples given below are found in the sources list of Table A1. Appendix 1. Examples from Amsterdam, Paris, Rome and Tel Aviv are taken from the case study findings (Chapters 6-9).
are ignored or tolerated, unless they lead to conflict with local residents. Similarly, the municipality displays a tolerant attitude toward ad hoc places of worship and other manifestations of Otherness, based on the expected temporary nature of these phenomena.

**Guestworker policy** is meant to meet the basic needs of labour migrants during their (presumably temporary) stay in the city. The municipality then assumes certain responsibilities, often as part of a division of tasks formulated in the national guestworker policy. Within this framework, local policies may range from minimalistic to generous, but Guestworker-type policies remain short- or medium-term solutions. Preventing (and not just reacting to) crises is the guiding line. Undocumented labour migrants falling outside the guestworker system are generally ignored, leaving civic organizations (unofficially) responsible for their welfare and holding the government responsible for their eventual repatriation or regularization.

Guestworker policies in the Juridical-political domain assume no need for representation and will thus ignore migrant mobilization, although informal cooperation with migrant organizations may occur (e.g. Tel Aviv, 1990s, Amsterdam early 1970s). Socio-economic policies will allow limited access to certain local services, including education for ‘guestworker children’, which may include home-language teaching to encourage return (Berlin). Housing policies are minimal, on the assumption that employers are taking care of ‘their’ workers’ lodging. In some cases the municipality may provide short-term solutions (guestworker barracks, or lodging migrants in housing scheduled for demolition, e.g. Amsterdam until the mid-1970s).

**The ‘Assimilationist’ attitude** marks a fundamental shift, in that labour migrants are now seen as a permanent phenomenon. This assumption may even extend to undocumented migrants whose eventual ‘regularization’ is expected through government amnesties. However, the Assimilationist attitude assumes that the migrants’ Otherness will eventually disappear as they gradually but inevitably assimilate into the host society. This process is considered one-sided: the migrant is expected to shed off his/her strange ways and integrate into the dominant culture -- if not in the first generation, then in the second. Conversely, public expressions of the migrant’s cultural Otherness (e.g. ethnic-based associations) are considered problematic, serving as an obstacle to integration. Spatial manifestations of difference and segregation in general are regarded as problems that must be overcome.

**Assimilationist policy** is meant to help the individual migrant integrate into the dominant host society, while minimizing the ethnic dimension. Needs are calculated and services provided (scholastic aid, public housing, neighbourhood renewal) according to general socio-economic criteria that disregard ethnic background and ignore any special problems (or potential) stemming from the migrants’ Otherness. Often it is difficult to identify Assimilationist-type policies toward migrants/minorities, since one characteristic of such policies is to deliberately ignore the ethnic
factor. Indeed, the absence of any ethnically-based definition of the target population (which is considered to be stigmatising) is a characteristic mechanism of Assimilationist policy (Paris).

Assimilationist policies in the Juridical-political domain encourage the civic incorporation of migrants while discouraging their mobilisation on an ethnic basis (Lille, La Courneuve). Socio-economic policies encourage integration into the labour market (e.g. vocational training projects) but ignore any ethnic factors. The exception to this is in migrant-targeted education policies, since fluency in the national language is considered a key factor in the integration process (Paris, Barcelona). In its spatial policies (e.g. zoning plans), the municipality will try to minimize public manifestations of Otherness such as mosques and discourage ethnic concentration through dispersal policies (Antwerp, Berlin, Brussels) or more implicitly, through policies encouraging gentrification or redevelopment in areas with an ethnic concentration (Brussels, Paris). Despite the universalist rhetoric, territorial policies may be identified as de facto ‘migrant policies’ in terms of their selective effect on the migrant/minority population in those areas.

The ‘Pluralist’ attitude assumes not only the permanence of the migrant presence, but also accepts their Otherness as a permanent feature in the city. Integration of ethnic minorities is now considered a process of mutual adjustment involving the host society as well as the newcomers. Indeed, the municipality may try to minimise the dominant ‘national culture’, emphasising instead a local culture of urban cosmopolitanism. Sensitivity to particular needs and problems arising from the migrants’ cultural Otherness characterizes the Pluralist attitude. In addition, the positive potential of this Otherness is recognised, and is expected to enrich the local host culture and economy in the long term. Thus, the ‘salad bowl’ metaphor replaces the assimilationist ‘melting pot’, with labour migrants and their descendants becoming another colourful ingredient in the multicultural mix.

Pluralist policies deliberately focus on ethnicity as a vital factor in the integration process. Policies range from support for minority religious and cultural practices, to promotion of ethnic entrepreneurship, to pro-active encouragement of ethnic organizations. Pluralist policies often apply a community-based approach, regarding ethnic-based empowerment as a vehicle rather than an obstacle in the integration process. But while stressing sensitivity to Otherness, these policies tend to lump together people in the same ‘ethnic category’, overlooking individual differences such as gender and educational background. Pluralist communication policies also target the host society, propagating the acceptance of difference and presenting ethnic Otherness as a positive potential for the city.

In the Juridical-political domain, pluralist policies promoting migrant participation are explicitly communitarian, as in the case of Amsterdam, which established no less than five advisory councils along ethnic lines. Socio-economic policies may also be set up on an ethnic basis, e.g. Sheffield’s

---

4 In Barcelona, migrants are taught in Catalan rather than Spanish in the expectation that they will assimilate into the Catalan culture.
5 See Gale and Naylor 2002 on policies toward mosques in England; see Rath et al. 2001 for a comparative analysis of policies in Rotterdam and Utrecht.
literacy programmes, and Birmingham’s ‘Employment and Resource Centres’ run by and for different ethnic communities. ‘Cultural sensitivity’ is promoted within the municipality and in the provision of local services through special units set up for this purpose as well as ethnic monitoring.\(^7\)

In the Cultural-religious domain, the municipality will support religious institutions which are regarded as instruments of integration (Rotterdam’s subsidisation of mosque organisations, 1980s-90s). In the Spatial domain, urban renewal policies will be sensitive to preserving the ethnic character of neighbourhoods.\(^8\)

3. Policy domains and issue areas

The second dimension is meant to arrange the hundreds of policies that may potentially be included in our definition of ‘local migrant policies’, by grouping them into policy domains, which are subdivided into issue areas.\(^9\) The elaboration of policy reactions by domain is important, allowing for the possibility that a city may have, for example, Assimilationist-type policies in one domain but Pluralist policies in another domain. This is vital in multi-city comparisons, since different cities may focus on different policy domains in their response, or the same city in different periods.\(^10\) The division of domains and issue areas proposed here is not meant to be exhaustive nor is it the only way in which policies can be ordered. Rather, the rows in Table 4.1 present one possible format for differentiating between different areas of local migrant policy.\(^11\)

The **Juridical-Political domain** addresses the civic incorporation of migrants/ethnic minorities. Although the distinction between municipalities with a significant proportion of enfranchised migrants/minorities (e.g. in the U.K.) and those with a largely non-enfranchised migrant population (e.g. in Italy) is important, many local policies apply in both cases. Migrant policies in this domain can be divided into three issue areas. The first relates to migrants’ civic status. Although usually a national policy matter, this can become a local policy matter when it is partly delegated (e.g. in Switzerland, the Netherlands and Germany) to local authorities, who can speed up or slow down naturalisation and regularisation procedures.\(^12\) The right to participate in local referenda, etc. may

---


\(^7\) For example, Birmingham and Amsterdam both pursued policies to sensitize employees to ethnic diversity. In both cities, ethnic monitoring is used to measure the progress of policy aimed at increasing the proportion of ethnic-origin municipal employees.

\(^8\) For example, Utrecht’s development scheme for the Lombok district deliberately involved the area’s ethnic entrepreneurs to prevent their dispersion (ELAINE 1996).

\(^9\) I am indebted to Rinus Penninx for suggesting this scheme. The inclusion of a Spatial domain, suggested by Sako Musterd, is explained below.

\(^10\) This was pointed out by Vermeulen (1997) in regard to national-level policies (see Chapter 3, section 2).

\(^11\) The issue areas are based on the findings of the literature survey. For clarity, each issue area is assigned to only one domain, although some could be placed in more than one domain. For example, ‘school policies’ appears in the Socio-economic domain but could also appear in the Cultural-religious domain (e.g. Birmingham’s school policies relating to religious practices) or the Spatial domain (e.g. school desegregation policy).

\(^12\) Berlin, for example, has adopted a naturalisation policy which now accounts for nearly a quarter of all discretionary naturalisations in Germany (Haussermann 1998).
also be left to municipal discretion.\textsuperscript{13} Other policies in this area range from providing information to migrants on their civic rights (Rome, Tel Aviv), to actively encouraging them to vote (Amsterdam, Stockholm).

The second issue area regards consultative structures, which often substitute or supplement formal voting rights. Dozens of local authorities across Europe have experimented with migrant 'advisory councils' and other consultative forms, with varying degrees of success.\textsuperscript{14} Another crucial area is the local authority's relation towards migrant organizations and mobilisation. Policies can range from support for migrant organizations as a means of empowerment, to cooptation or exclusion of these organisations as a means of control.\textsuperscript{15}

The \textit{Socio-Economic domain} comprises a large number of issue areas, including newcomer reception services, education, welfare services, labour market policies, etc. German cities, for example, have focused on labour market integration, while Dutch cities have focused on political participation and social services. Many cities with a significant migrant population provide reception and orientation services. These may be part of a national reception policy (Paris) or a local initiative (Tel Aviv), and may range from minimal 'office hours' services to comprehensive programmes, including short-term lodgings (Rome).

Social (welfare) services are an issue area where the local authority has a wide choice of policies. These may include developing specific services or programmes for migrants (projects for migrant youth or women, etc.), or adapting general services (health, welfare) to migrant needs. Adaptation of local services ranges from providing translated material to the use of 'cultural mediators' (Rome).\textsuperscript{16}

Providing services to migrants as part of the general population rather than preferentially is also a policy option (Brussels, Oeiras), as is delegation of some services to civic (including migrant) organizations (Amsterdam, Rome). Policies to strengthen migrant participation in the labour market may include vocational training, language instruction, support for migrant entrepreneurs, monitoring discrimination in the labour market, and affirmative hiring policies within the municipality.

A crucial issue area in cities with second-generation migrants is education.\textsuperscript{17} While this policy area is often dominated by the state, local authorities still have considerable leverage (even where school directors and teachers are not formally municipal employees). Local policies may include allocating extra resources to schools with a high proportion of migrant pupils, attempts at school

\textsuperscript{13} For example, some cities in Italy (Turin, Bologna) have extended this right to non-citizen migrants while others have not. Since the European Commission Directive of 1994 local voting rights have gradually been extended to all foreign residents with EU citizenship.

\textsuperscript{14} See Anderson (1990) for a classification of consultative structures for migrants. For a (not very positive) evaluation of migrant advisory councils in various cities, see ELAINE 1997b.

\textsuperscript{15} Delegating the provision of local services to migrant organizations is another policy option with political implications. For comparative analyses of local policies toward migrant political mobilization, see Ireland 1994, Blommaert and Martiniello 1996, Garbaye 2000, Bousetta 2001. Koopmans and Berger 2003.

\textsuperscript{16} Persons of the same/similar ethnic origin as the target population, but with veterancy in the host society that allows them to act as translators and cultural interpreters. Often, cultural mediators are formally trained and accredited in this position.
desegregation, support for extra-curricular projects (e.g. tutoring in the home-language), etc. Conversely, local education policies may disregard the ethnic element.

Finally, policing and security may be a local policy area in cities with a municipal police force. Municipal police may then serve as agents of social change (Stuttgart, Leicester) or as agents of control toward migrant residents.\(^\text{18}\)

The **Cultural-Religious domain** includes those policies specifically relating to the cultural Otherness of the migrants. Local authorities’ relations toward religious institutions and practices (mosques, *halal* butchers, ethnic festivals), as well as their relation to religious schools, range from neglect to support to discouragement.\(^\text{19}\) Religious instruction/practices in local schools may play an important role in this domain. For example, Birmingham’s city council established a joint working committee with religious organizations to settle matters such as prayer facilities, Muslim dress and diet, and curriculum changes in schools. Another issue area involves sensitizing the host society to cultural differences. Communication policies aim to sensitize the general public to ethnic diversity (or within institutions, including the municipality itself), using measures such as employee seminars, media campaigns, cultural manifestations and permanent (multi-)cultural centres. Communication policies can emphasise different messages: anti-discrimination, anti-racism, multiculturalism, or assimilation.

Lastly, certain issue areas with strong spatial implications can be grouped into a **Spatial domain**. Housing policies, whether migrant-targeted (e.g. guestworker hostels) or general (social housing policy, renovation policies, etc.) may be considered ‘migrant policies’ when they significantly affect migrants at the local level. Local housing policies are especially influential where a significant percentage of the housing stock is controlled by the municipality, either directly (e.g. in the U.K.) or indirectly (e.g. in the Netherlands). Overlapping with housing policies is the issue area of urban development and renewal. Although normally not targeting migrants explicitly, urban development/renewal policies may be regarded as migrant policies if they significantly affect the local migrant population. This includes explicit or implicit policies to disperse migrant enclaves (housing quotas in Berlin until 1990, urban renewal policies in Brussels), as well as urban renewal that protects local residents (Amsterdam, Stockholm).\(^\text{20}\) School desegregation policies are another form of dispersal attempted by some cities.

---


\(^{18}\) In the four case studies in this book, policing and security was not a significant policy issue area in regard to migrants. For a comparison of local policing policies in American and French cities, see Body-Gendrot 2001.

\(^{19}\) In their comparative study on policies toward Islam (focusing on Rotterdam, Utrecht, Bradford and Brussels), Rath et al. (1999: 10) observe: "[t]he institutions can react in three different ways to the presence of Islam, its adherents and their claims: they can actively promote or support the formation of new Muslim institutions; they can be passive and adopt a more or less neutral attitude; or they can actively oppose the development of new institutions, for instance by the literal application of regulations, and by delays in putting them into force, or by laying down new restrictions."

\(^{20}\) For example, Kesteloot & Cortie (1998) compare urban development policies in Amsterdam and Brussels. The former aimed for a population mix through subsidized public and private rentals in the central city as well as outlying neighbourhoods, while the latter favoured home ownership over tenants and office development in the central city. This
The Spatial domain also includes the issue of symbolic uses of space such as mosque buildings. Here again cities have adopted very different policies, from discouraging or limiting physical manifestations of Otherness (withholding building permits, limiting minaret height, etc.), to providing financial support. Even the use of public spaces such as parks or shopping malls by migrants, if perceived by native residents as an ‘invasion of territory’, may turn into a policy matter that the municipality can address in various ways.

4 Integrated typology of local migrant policies

Combining these two dimensions produces a typology space or classification system of actual or potential local migrant policies. The cells of this matrix can now be filled in, with each cell representing how a specific policy phase is expressed in a specific issue area (Table 4.2, below). Following one policy type (column), we can see how it is expressed across different issue areas. Following one issue area (row), we can see how policies will change according to the different types (or phases). The policies appearing in Table 4.2 are a mix of inductive and deductive reasoning. Some are based on actual policies found in the literature survey and classified according to the scheme, others are deduced directly from the typology as ‘potential policies’ that may or may not actually exist.

The typology can be used as an analytical framework for in-depth research of a city’s migrant policies. This framework allows us to identify the various local migrant policies in a city, arrange them by domains and issue areas, and classify them according to the ideal types described above. We can then follow changes over time from one type/phase to another, identifying a trajectory of policy responses in the city (e.g. from Non-policy to Assimilationist to Pluralist policy). A policy response trajectory may be identified across several domains or only in certain policy areas (e.g. the shift to Pluralist policies may occur in the Socio-economic and Cultural-religious domains, while policies in other domains remain ‘Assimilationist’).

If we identify the phases of actual migrant settlement (e.g. when family reunification occurs in a significant proportion of the migrant population this signals a shift from a guestworker phase to permanent settlement), we can then follow the degree of fit between the trajectory of migrant settlement and the trajectory of policy responses in the city. This can be repeated for different cities to determine if there are typical or common trajectories of local policy responses to migrant settlement, and to compare the degree of fit between migrant settlement phases and policy responses in different cities (see Chapter 10).

created very different situations for migrants in these cities, not only in housing but also in terms of social, economic and spatial segregation.
22 Cf. Sibley 1995. For example, see Body-Gendrot (2001) on the policy adopted in Marseille to involve youth in the planning and construction of a new shopping mall in an overwhelmingly minority-inhabited area, with the aim of preventing vandalism.
23 Determining the fit between the policy type and the actual migration phase requires in-depth knowledge of the local context. This is not easy, but not impossible, as demonstrated in the case studies.
As with every classification system, this typology is subject to various qualifications. Table 4.2 does not present an accurate description of a particular situation, but an analytical framework that can be applied to different cities and policies, to better understand them as a whole. The policy types proposed here are ideals, and no city is expected to conform to one type across all the issue areas. As noted in Chapter 3, local authorities are not unitary agents and may (indeed, often do) pursue different types of policies concurrently. However, it should be possible to identify *prevailing* municipal attitudes and policy types in a city over a given period (another city may be characterized by a mix of policy types across different domains). Such a framework may also suggest which domains or policy areas tend to dominate municipal policy responses to the presence of labour migrants in a given period.

It is important to note that the order of the policy types in Table 4.2 does not represent a fixed trajectory of policy responses. Although the policy types can represent a development over time (i.e. phases), they do not necessarily represent a development from exclusionary to inclusionary responses. In other words, this typology is not meant as a normative framework. If some judgement can be made of actual policies using this typology, it should be based on the fit between the policy type and the actual phase of migration. Thus, guestworker-type policies may be appropriate when the migrant presence is indeed of a temporary, guestworker character. If this develops into a phase of permanent settlement but local policies remain ‘stuck’ in the guestworker phase, then they are problematic.

This classification scheme can be used as a framework to follow one city’s policy reactions over time, or to compare the policy reactions of different cities across various domains and issue areas. It is not meant as a formula into which we can plug in a policy or city and summarily draw conclusions. Instead, the typology can be used to reach *preliminary* conclusions about the prevailing attitudes and policy aims in the city (or cities) under study, by identifying what policy types appeared, at what time, and in what domains. Having mapped out the ‘what and when’, we can then focus on the ‘hows and whys’ using a case study approach. The typology is thus meant to complement, and not replace, the in-depth approach that has characterized much of the local-level research up to now. This is what will be tested in the following chapters.
Table 4.2 Typology of local migrant policies, by domains and issue areas

* Selected policies and cities given as examples.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HOST-STRANGER RELS: Attitudes/assumptions of local authority</th>
<th>POLICY TYPES:</th>
<th>DOMAINS/issue areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Migrants as transient phenomenon</td>
<td>NON-POLICY</td>
<td>JURIDICAL-POLITICAL Civic status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrants as temporary Guestworkers</td>
<td>GUESTWORKER POLICY</td>
<td>Lobby the government to regularise illegals (Tel Aviv)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrants as permanent; but their Otherness will disappear (Assimilation)</td>
<td>ASSIMILATIONIST POLICY</td>
<td>Facilitate naturalisation (Berlin, Cologne)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrants as permanent; their Otherness should be supported.</td>
<td>PLURALIST POLICY</td>
<td>Support regularisation (Oeiras). Extend local enfranchisement (Turin, Bologna). Lobby govt. to regularise illegals (Paris '01)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consultative structures</th>
<th>Ignore migrant associations (Rome 80s, Athens)</th>
<th>Informal cooperation with migrant associations on limited issues (Barcelona, Tel Aviv)</th>
<th>Co-opt or exclude migrant associations; delegation to migrant associations is implicit (Paris, Lille)</th>
<th>Support migrant associations as agents of empowerment (Amsterdam 80s, Birmingham) : Delegate services to associations (Amsterdam, Birmingham)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Migrant organisations/ mobilisation</td>
<td>Ad-hoc access to some services (Athens)</td>
<td>Formalise access to selected local services (Tel Aviv mid-90s)</td>
<td>Equal access to all services (ignore ethnic-based needs). (Brussels, Barcelona)</td>
<td>Reception/orientation service (Rome 90s, Tel Aviv 90s). Ethnically-targeted specific services (Amsterdam, Birmingham, Stuttgart)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIO-ECONOMIC Social services</td>
<td>Ignore black market activity (Rome 90s, Tel Aviv)</td>
<td>Minimal regulation of legal work conditions. Limited vocational assistance</td>
<td>Anti-discrimination policy. General vocational training (non-ethnic criteria) (Lille)</td>
<td>Affirmative hiring policy (Antwerp). Ethnic-based vocational training and entrepreneurs policy (Amsterdam 80s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(reception/orientation, welfare and health, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labour market</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools</td>
<td>Ad hoc access for migrant children (Rome 80s, Tel Aviv 90s)</td>
<td>Possible home-language classes (Berlin 70s)</td>
<td>Spatial dispersal (school desegregation) (Berlin). Support national language tutoring (Zurich)</td>
<td>Extra support to schools based on ethnic pupil ratio (Turin, Amsterdam). Home-language classes (Berlin), religion/culture classes (Birmingham)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policing/Conflict resolution</td>
<td>Ad hoc reaction to conflict situations</td>
<td>Municipal police as agents of migrant regulation</td>
<td>Area-based policing (possible implicit targeting of migrants)</td>
<td>Police as social agents with migrant-targeted projects (Rotterdam). Pro-active anti-racism enforcement (Leicester)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CULTURAL-RELIGIOUS</td>
<td>Ignore ad-hoc places of worship</td>
<td>Informal acknowledgement of ad-hoc places of worship (Amsterdam 70s, Tel Aviv 90s)</td>
<td>Discourage institutions (e.g. mosques, religious schools). (Utrecht 80s, Marseille)</td>
<td>Support religious institutions as agents of integration and empowerment (Amsterdam, Birmingham)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority religion in school</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public awareness/Communication policies</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Anti-racism/anti-discrimination campaigns</td>
<td>Multi-cultural manifestations, projects 'celebrate diversity' (Berlin, Frankfurt)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPATIAL Housing</td>
<td>Ignore housing problems, ad-hoc reaction to crises (Rome 80s)</td>
<td>Possible short-term solutions (guestworker lodging (Berlin 60s, Amsterdam early 70s))</td>
<td>Equal access to social housing (universal criteria). Ignore ethnic-based discrimination in housing market (Marseille)</td>
<td>Anti-discrimination policy incl. ethnic monitoring (Bradford, Birmingham)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban development, relation to ethnic enclaves</td>
<td>Ignore ethnic enclaves, disperse if crisis arises. (Rome 80s)</td>
<td>Ethnic enclaves considered temporary. (Amsterdam 70s, Tel Aviv 90s)</td>
<td>Ethnic enclaves seen as urban problem. Dispersal policy (Berlin, Frankfurt 70s). Gentrification policy (Cologne, Brussels, Paris).</td>
<td>Recognise potential of ethnic enclaves (Tel Aviv). Renewal with residents policy (Frankfurt)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symbolic uses of space, public spaces</td>
<td>Ignore in peripheral locations, discourage in central locations (Rome)</td>
<td>Ignore in peripheral locations, discourage in central locations (Tel Aviv)</td>
<td>Oppose physical manifestation of Otherness ('mosques w/out minarets') (Utrecht, Paris)</td>
<td>Support physical manifestations of Otherness (monuments, museums, minarets) (Amsterdam, Cologne)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>